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Abstract

How does the mainstream/centre right Conservative Party frame immigration in contrast to how the radical right UKIP frames immigration? Despite a lot of previous research on the two parties and their views on immigration, there is no clear answer to this question and to how similar the parties are after the Brexit referendum. As national populism is a fast growing movement within the Western World and due to the fact that there is a lack of research on these parties and their views on immigration after the Brexit referendum, this paper aims to do a comparative analysis of ideas on the Conservative Party's and UKIP's views on immigration. In order to investigate this, I make use of previous research to construct an analysis apparatus that enables me to analyze arguments and proposals on immigration presented by the two parties. This paper aims to compare the two parties and their views on immigration by investigating the argumentations and language that they use in their official party material. In order to give a more holistic answer to the research question, newspaper articles including arguments and quotes from party representatives are also analysed. The paper contributes with new answers on how similar the parties are, indicating that they have a very similar approach on immigration and on how to control it.
# Table of Contents

**Introduction and Background**  
- Purpose and Research Question 5  
- Disposition 5  

**Previous Research and Theoretical Approach** 6  
- The framing of immigration in political debates 6  
- The framing of immigration based on xenophobic, racist and islamophobic ideas 8  
- Expectations based on Previous Research 9  

**Method and Material** 12  
- Analysis of Ideas 12  
- Analysis Apparatus 13  
- Material 19  

**Empirics and Analysis** 21  
- The Conservative Party 21  
  - Problems for the labour market 21  
  - Problems for public order, security and safety 24  
  - Problems for culture and values 25  
  - Problems for public services 28  
  - Problems for housing and urban growth 29  
  - Summary of the empirics and analysis on the Conservative Party 29  
- UKIP 30  
  - Problems for the labour market 31  
  - Problems for public order, security and safety 31  
  - Problems for culture and values 34  
  - Problems for public services 36  
  - Problems for housing and urban growth 37  
  - Summary of the empirics and analysis on UKIP 38  
- Comparative Analysis 39  
  - Problems for the labour market 39  
  - Problems for public order, security and safety 40  
  - Problems for culture and values 41  
  - Problems for public services 42  
  - Problems for housing and urban growth 43  
  - Other findings 44  

**Discussion** 44  
**Conclusion** 47  
**List of References** 49  
- Literature 49  
- Official party material 51  
- Newspaper articles 52  
- Other material 55
Introduction and Background

During the time before the Brexit referendum right-wing populist parties effectively spread concerns about immigration-related issues (Hobolt, 2016:1260). The Vote Leave campaign focused a lot on how immigration would get out of control if Britain remained within the EU (Ibid:1262). Why the Leave campaign won can possibly be because of the fact that it not only focused on immigration, but also on all the problems that immigration can lead up to (Goodwin & Milazzo, 2017:462). The Leave campaign seem to have had great emotional impact on the voters who were already concerned about immigration, possibly making them more concerned about how immigration affects the economy, culture and welfare within British societies. Another explanation for why Brexit got such strong support is that citizens who “feel that their national identity or position is threatened by EU integration and/or immigration” are likely to support leaving the EU (Ibid:455). European identity and the advent of crises, such as the 2015 migration crisis, “leads to various kinds of mobilizations of the most regressive and reactionary features of ‘Europeanness’: the protection of the national or supranational territory, the protection of the European people” (Romana Ammaturo, 2018:4). The protection of the national territory and its’ residents can be referred to as national populism - a movement that prioritizes the interests and culture of the nation and its’ people (Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018:xi). National populism is argued to develop as an effect of four different societal changes, where of one of these changes is due to immigration and ‘hyper ethnic change’ (Ibid:xxi). The concept ‘hyper ethnic change’ refers to uncontrolled immigration of people from different countries and cultures (Ibid:131). These large flows of immigrants are furthermore understood as fuelling fears about “the possible destruction of the national group’s historic identity and established ways of life” (Ibid:xxii).

We already know a lot about how pro Brexit parties framed immigration as threatening before the Brexit referendum. As mentioned, national populist and pro Brexit parties focused a lot on the issue of immigration and on how it would get out of control if Britain remained within the EU. There is however a lack of research on the framing of immigration after the referendum. Many previous studies (Doerr, 2017; Geddes, 2014; Helbling, 2014; Hogan & Haltinner, 2015; Huysmans & Buonfino, 2008; Roos, 2018) on the framing of immigration have investigated the political debate in the US, other European countries or other political parties. Another study (Hogan and Haltinner, 2015) on the far
right in the UK has investigated the British National Party (BNP) and how it frames immigration in more detail. Other studies (Bale, 2013; Dennison & Goodwin, 2015; Evans & Mellon, 2019; Partos & Bale, 2015; Widfeldt & Brandenburg, 2018) have investigated UKIP (UK Independence Party) and the Conservative Party, and their approaches on immigration. However, studies on these parties seem to have investigated the more general approach on immigration. There seem to be a lack of research that compares these two political parties by investigating how they frame immigration in more detail. Previous studies have not aimed to compare how the parties frame immigration by using more specific frames, which is typically used when investigating party positions in a specific political debate (Hängli, 2012; Kriesi, 2012). Other previous studies (Alonso & da Fonseca, 2011; Bale, 2013; Dennison & Goodwin, 2015; Geddes, 2014; Partos & Bale, 2015; Widfeldt and Brandenburg, 2018) have shown how UKIP has always been defined as a radical right party, while the Conservative Party has balanced between sometimes being more mainstream/centre right and sometimes being more radical right.

Since many political parties across the world have moved towards right wing ideas and due to the fact that right wing parties have gained great electoral support the past few years (Doerr, 2017; Solomos, 2013), it is interesting to research whether the Conservative Party has changed its’ ideas about immigration or not. Is it still balancing between mainstream and radical right ideas, or has it possibly moved towards more radical right ideas on immigration? Can it still be defined as a mainstream/centre right party compared to the radical right UKIP on the issue of immigration, or do the parties have similar views on immigration? As national populism is a fast growing movement within many western countries and due of the fact that Brexit is the result of such a movement, it is especially interesting to investigate right wing parties within the context of Brexit.
**Purpose & Research Question**

This thesis aims to investigate how the Conservative Party frames immigration in contrast to how a radical right party like UKIP frames immigration. In other words, it aims to investigate how these parties frame immigration by looking at their proposals and arguments about immigration. It aims to research whether the two parties take on a similar anti-immigrant approach when framing immigration, or if there are any differences in their ways of framing immigration. Based on the purpose the following research question have been constructed:

*How does the Conservative Party frame immigration in contrast to how UKIP frames immigration?*

This thesis aims to do a detailed comparative analysis of the parties’ approaches on immigration. Since we already know that UKIP is a radical right and xenophobic party, the research is motivated by the possible changes within the Conservative Party. The paper is constructed as a comparative analysis, but the concluding discussion will mostly focus on the findings about the Conservative Party as these are the findings of greatest interest. Moreover, as there is a lack of more detailed research on these two parties’ views on immigration after the Brexit referendum, this paper aims to investigate the parties’ views on immigration between 2016-2019.

**Disposition**

The paper starts off with a section on previous research and theoretical approach. This section is then summarized in a couple of important points that have been used to construct the analysis apparatus and to compare the parties’ views on immigration. The paper continues with a section on the choice of method and material, and then moves on to empirics and analysis. This section first presents the empirics and analysis of the Conservative Party, and then carries on with UKIP. This section is then followed by a comparative analysis on the two parties. At last, the final discussion and conclusions follow.
Previous Research and Theoretical Approach

This section will present previous research on the framing of immigration in political debates and on the framing of immigration based on xenophobic, racist and islamophobic ideas. The previous research will also work as the theoretical approach for this paper. The expectations on this paper’s findings based on previous research are presented at the end of this section.

The framing of immigration in political debates

Helbling (2014:32) investigated how political parties across Europe frame immigration and found support for that moral-universal arguments occur most often in immigration debates. These frames refer to “general moral principles and universal rights that are claimable and acceptable by everyone regardless of his or her particular interests or cultural identity”, such as civil rights like non-discrimination and political rights like democracy (Ibid:24). Moreover, Helbling (Ibid:35) found that nationalistic frames are mostly used by conservative and far-right parties. These frames “include statements that express xenophobic attitudes that deplore the loss of unique national traditions and values, or that articulate a fear of ‘Islamisation’” (Ibid:24). It is also found that larger parties use economic arguments about for example the attraction of high skilled immigrants, productivity and international competition (Ibid:24-25) more often than smaller parties do (Ibid:35). Smaller parties rather focus on arguments about social security and labour. “It appears that the populist right parties pursue a social protectionist discourse rather than an economically liberal one.” Moreover, “populist right parties gravitate towards nationalistic argumentation”. In addition, Bale (2013) argues that the Conservative Party tends to argue for the restriction of immigration, and has done so for a long period of time. The party has in periods used a more populist language when framing immigration, but has most often “refused to go as far as they might, and certainly as far as radical right-wing populist parties now routinely go” (Ibid:35). In comparison, Partos and Bale (2015:172) argue that the Conservative Party has used a tougher rhetoric in their immigration policy since around 2005. The party has since then framed immigration as either ‘good’ or ‘bad’ for Britain (Ibid:173). Good immigrants are for example economic immigrants and investors who can contribute to the British economy and businesses. On the other end of the spectrum, next to illegal immigrants who are the most unwanted, are low skilled and low paid immigrants. These immigrants are expected to increase unemployment among the native labour force and put unwelcome high demands on public services. Another
study (Alonso & da Fonseca, 2011:867) shows how mainstream right parties like the Conservative Party “finds itself in a deadlocked situation between the political moderation and office-seeking interests of the centre and centre-right and the anti-immigrant appeal of the extreme Right.”

In comparison to how the Conservative Party has framed immigration during the past few years, UKIP has taken on a bit more hard-line rhetoric. UKIP is defined as a party that is somewhere in between the Conservative Party and the very radical right BNP. Another study (Widfeldt and Brandenburg, 2018:597) argues that UKIP, on the one hand, has a very radical right approach on immigration. On the other hand, UKIP has during the last couple of years become much more competitive among Conservative and Labour supporters. Although UKIP has moved towards the mainstream in some senses, it still has some elements of far-right radicalism and links to the BNP. Other previous studies (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015; Geddes, 2014) show how UKIP has focused heavily on immigration-related issues in political debates, often arguing about the destabilising effects of uncontrolled immigration and “putting the issue at the heart of a broader narrative about national loss, threat and abandonment, which was directed strongly to lower middle-class and working-class white Britons” (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015:185).

In line with Helbling (2014), Hogan and Haltinner (2015) found support for that far-right political parties use arguments expressing fears on immigration-related issues. However, in contrast to Helbling’s (2014:35) findings on that larger conservative parties use economic arguments while smaller far-right parties rather focus on social security and labour arguments, Hogan and Haltinner (2015) found support for the fact that far-right parties use arguments that frame immigrants as threats to culture, security and economy. They found that far-right parties such as the BNP frame immigration as an economic threat because of how immigration is argued to depress wages, take jobs from native borns, and increase the cost of living and “the economic burden on citizen taxpayers by drawing heavily on public services such as education, healthcare and social welfare programmes” (Ibid:528-529). These parties also frame immigration as a security threat by for example arguing that immigration increases crime rates and relating immigration to the threat of Islamic terrorism (Ibid:529-530). Moreover, immigration is often framed as a cultural threat by these parties. The mass immigration of people that are presumed to be very different and culturally diverse from the white native population “both disrupts social solidarity and threatens to destroy native-born
culture” (Ibid:531). More current research has furthermore argued that concerns about immigration nowadays focus a lot on cultural fears, especially on fears about the immigration of muslims (Eatwell and Goodwin, 2018; Kaufmann, 2018). Cultural threats have possibly become even more important issues than economic threats (Eatwell and Goodwin, 2018:151). Fears about whether the muslim faith and ways of living are compatible with the West’s fundamental values of democracy and gender equality are argued to “influence the type of immigration that people support”. As an effect of the growing worries about cultural incompatibility and Islamic terrorism, populist-right parties started to focus more on protecting the nation from muslim immigration (Huysmans & Buonfino, 2008; Kaufmann, 2018:250).

A large part of previous research (Balabanova & Balch, 2010; Balch & Balabanova, 2016; Benson & Wood, 2015) on the framing of immigration have used analysis apparatuses including a frame that refers to ‘problems for society’. This frame often refers to problems for security, economy, culture and values, but also to problems for public services and housing. Balch and Balabanova (2016) showed how immigration often is argued to put high demands on schools, hospitals and housing. Other studies (Balabanova & Balch, 2010; Baur et al, 2016; Hogan & Haltinner, 2015) have also argued that immigration often is framed as increasing the costs of education and housing. Furthermore, Benson & Wood (2015:807) suggested a frame called ‘solution enforcement’ which refers to how politicians “deny immigrants opportunities for work, health care, education, or services so they will self-deport”. Their research suggests that this frame is frequently used by anti-immigration and right-wing parties and associations (Ibid:817).

The framing of immigration based on xenophobic, racist and islamophobic ideas

Hogan and Haltinner’s (2015:533) findings also suggest that racist arguments are quite frequently used among far-right parties. The BNP has for example described the “‘genetically predetermined’ tendency of Western Europeans towards democracy, equality, and individual freedom, and implies that migrants of non-European descent do not share this ‘natural-born’ trait”. Other political actors have used metaphors like parasites and floods to describe immigrant groups. In addition, Fox et al (2012) researched the framing of migration to the UK and suggested that the British approach on immigration has focused a lot on identifying
“racially desirable and undesirable immigrants” (Ibid:682). They found support for that a racialized frame that is frequently used to describe the scope and scale of immigration refers to the use of metaphors such as deluges, floods and streams to describe immigrants (Ibid:686). The next, frequently occurring, frame refers to the correlation between immigrants and crime. This frame posits an “inherent link between migrant and criminal” (Ibid:687). Romanians were most often subjected to this frame at the time for this study. Because of the fact that Romanians were framed as a main issue in Britain in the beginning of the twenty-first century, a third frame was constructed. The ‘Roma’ frame refers to the great focus on framing Romanians as “epitomizing and embodying cultural backwardness” and is often used in combination with the other frames. It is however assumed that the great focus on Romanians has heavily declined. It is rather assumed that the greatest focus will nowadays be on Muslims and cultural incompatibility with the Muslim faith (Eatwell and Goodwin, 2018; Kaufmann, 2018; Swami et al, 2018).

In addition, Doerr (2017) researched network publics that were created by far-right political parties across Europe and found that immigrants were framed as criminals and intruders. Doerr (Ibid) studied ‘black sheep posters’ that illustrate how a black sheep is being kicked out by a white sheep. These posters are used by several far-right political parties across Europe and frame immigrants as criminals that do not belong in the countries that they have immigrated to. Black and white stand for different groups in society, whereas white stands for the homogeneous homeland (Ibid:13). The findings suggest that “racist argumentation is not spelled out explicitly at the linguistic level, but the ambiguous visual representation symbolizes the construction of borders through explicit color codes”.

**Expectations based on Previous Research**

Previous research like Helbling (2013) found support for that larger mainstream parties use economic arguments about for example the attraction of high skilled immigrants and productivity more often than smaller parties do. Smaller fringe parties are rather expected to focus on arguments about social security and labour. The Conservative Party is thus expected to focus on economic arguments and proposals about attracting the skills that Britain needs, while UKIP is expected to focus on arguments and proposals about security and labour.

Previous studies on the Conservative Party (Alonso & da Fonseca, 2011; Bale, 2013; Partos & Bale, 2015) has shown how the party has moved between being more mainstream
and less radical right in periods, and more radical right in other periods. Another study (Widfeldt and Brandenburg, 2018) argues that UKIP has, on the one hand, moved towards the mainstream and become more competitive with the Conservative Party. On the other hand, UKIP still has strong links to the radical right. The parties are thus expected to have a lot of things in common. They are expected to use similar arguments on immigration, but UKIP is also expected to be a bit more radical right using a more hard-line rhetoric on immigration.

Both parties are expected to especially focus on framing immigration as a cultural threat. Previous studies (Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018; Huysmans & Buonfino, 2008; Kaufmann, 2018) have shown how populist-right parties for example focus on protecting the nation from muslim immigration as an effect of growing worries about cultural incompatibility. Eatwell and Goodwin (2018:172) even predicted that worries over immigration and ethnic change would intensify in the future. As national populism has become very strong in Britain and as an effect of the growing worries about 'hyper ethnic change’, it is expected that the focus on cultural threats has intensified during the past few years.

Based on findings from previous studies (Alonso & da Fonseca, 2011; Bale, 2013; Benson & Wood, 2015; Partos & Bale, 2015; Widfeldt and Brandenburg, 2018; among others), both parties are expected to frame immigration as a great problem for the society. This refers to the framing of immigration as a great problem for the economy and the welfare system, which can be divided into five different dimensions: problems for the labour market, problems for public order, security and safety, problems for public services, problems for housing and urban growth, and problems for culture and values. These dimensions will be further presented in the section on the analysis apparatus.

As Benson & Wood (2015:807) argued, both the Conservative Party and UKIP are expected to make use of the so called 'solution enforcement’ frame which refers to how politicians restrict and control immigration by denying “immigrants opportunities for work, health care, education, or services so they will self-deport”. Other strict proposals on how to restrict and control immigration are also expected to occur. Since the Conservative Party is expected to be more of a mainstream/centre right party compared to UKIP that is defined as a radical right party, it is expected that the Conservative Party will suggest 'softer' solutions on immigration-related issues while UKIP is expected to suggest stricter solutions.
Other previous studies have shown how radical right parties frequently make use of racist arguments (Doerr, 2017; Fox et al, 2012; Hogan & Haltinner, 2015). Some arguments are thus expected to be based on racism, xenophobia and islamophobia. Muslims are expected to be especially affected by such arguments as a result of the growing worries about the immigration of Muslims, and cultural incompatibility with the Muslim faith and Muslims’ ways of living. Since UKIP is the party with the strongest links to the radical right, it is expected to be the party that uses racist arguments the most. The Conservative Party is also expected to make use of arguments and proposals that are based on xenophobic, racist and islamophobic ideas, but probably not as frequently as UKIP. This expectation is based on the international trend of political parties leaning more towards right wing and national populist ideas (Doerr, 2017; Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018; Kaufmann, 2018; Solomos, 2013). Furthermore, party members are expected to more frequently make use of a more radical language, compared to the official party material which is expected to contain of a more ‘politically correct’ language.
Method and Material

This section starts of with a discussion on the choice of method, and then continues with the analysis apparatus and a discussion on the choice of material.

Analysis of Ideas

Political ideas have great influence on people's political attitudes and behaviour, and it is therefore of great importance to critically review and analyze political messages (Beckman, 2005:9). Considering the aim of the thesis, I argue an analysis of ideas is a suitable method as it allows me to analyze political messages, and the ideas and ideologies that lie behind these messages (Ibid:12). An analysis of ideas can seek to describe, explain or critically review phenomena. Since this thesis aims to make sense of political messages and the ideologies or ideas that might lie behind these messages, it seems reasonable to use a descriptive analysis of ideas. A descriptive analysis of ideas allows the researcher to dig deeper into the material and draw conclusions on the content of the material. Since the aim of this study is to describe political messages, a descriptive analysis of ideas can be an useful method as it allows me to “systematically sort out the material in a way that cannot be immediately or concretely deduced from the material in itself” (Ibid:50). It can for example say something about the ideas or ideologies that lie behind a political message.

In order to describe the material, it is also necessary to somehow compare the material by using different types of dimensions or ideal types (Ibid:52). This can also be done by comparing different types of material, for example comparing material from different political parties and actors. Such a method gives the research more information about different political ideologies and ideas, and how political parties and actors might share political ideologies and ideas. Moreover, it is necessary to use some kind of analytical apparatus when describing and comparing the material (Ibid:53). The analytical apparatus for this research is based on commonly occurring discussions and arguments from previous research. This will be further discussed in the next section.

It is also important to mention that this research is built upon a subjective interpretation of political messages. The main limitation of this method is therefore the reliability of the study. This problem can however be partially solved by the analytical apparatus that helps to analyze the material in a systematic way.
Analysis Apparatus

The analysis apparatus (table 1) builds upon arguments from previous research on how political parties from the UK and other European countries have debated about immigration. The dimensions presented below refer to the most common arguments that are found in the material. It can be argued that the study's validity is strengthened because of how the following dimensions are based on common arguments from previous research and analysis apparatuses used by previous studies. Validity refers to how well-founded a measurement is and its' ability to measure what we actually want to measure (Esaiasson et al., 2017:222). Because of how the measurement is based on a large part of previous research, it can be argued that the chance for that the validity is good increases.

Previous research has shown how far-right parties frame immigration as threats against culture, for example as an effect of that the immigration of Muslims is seen as a threat against British values, culture and traditions (Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018; Hogan & Haltinner, 2015; Kaufmann, 2018). Immigration is also related to unemployment, the depression of wages, increased costs of living and high demands on public services such as the NHS and schools (Helbling, 2014; Hogan and Haltinner, 2015). Immigration is furthermore framed as a security threat, for example because of how immigration is related to high crime rates and an increased risk of Islamic terrorism (Doerr, 2017; Helbling, 2014; Hogan and Haltinner, 2015). Another study (Balch & Balabanova, 2016) has shown how immigration often is argued to put high demands on schools, hospitals and housing. Other research (Balabanova & Balch, 2010; Hogan & Haltinner, 2015) have also argued that immigration often is framed as increasing the costs of education and housing.

It is important to be aware of that the material comes from political parties and campaigns that are pro-Brexit and anti-immigration, and it is therefore assumed that the chosen material primarily includes arguments against immigration and negative attitudes towards immigrants. As mentioned by Beckman (2005:23), the design of the dimensions should depend on the purpose of the research and the expected findings from the material. Moreover, since dimensions are aspects of arguments and statements it is of great importance that they capture different types of arguments (Ibid:26). There is a risk of causing confusion over the results if the dimensions overlap and capture the same arguments. It is also important that the dimensions capture all kinds of arguments in order not to miss any important findings.
or details in the material (Ibid:26-27). This is harder to control and does not have to cause any big problems for the research, but it is important to have in mind when constructing the dimensions.

A possible limitation with this analysis apparatus is that it can sometimes be hard to know exactly what dimension an argument or proposal refers to. I have however tried to solve this problem by operationalizations on all dimensions, which makes it easier to to know what dimension an argument or proposal refers to.

Table 1. Arguments (dimensions) and descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problems for labour market</td>
<td>Immigration threatens the labour market in several ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration can for example be related to high levels of unemployment and the depression of wages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for public order, security and safety</td>
<td>Immigration threatens the public order, social security and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration and ‘immigrant dense’ areas are for example often related to high levels of criminality and to a feeling of being unsafe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for public services</td>
<td>Immigration relates to high demands on public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration is for example related to high demands on the NHS and schools, which for example results in long waiting times for people who seek medical treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for housing &amp; urban growth</td>
<td>Immigration results in high demands on housing and increases the costs for housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for values and culture</td>
<td>Immigration threatens a country's values and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration is related to the development of a multi cultural society, and the inclusion of cultures and faiths that might counter the ‘original’ culture and values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to be able to make a difference between different arguments and the different types of dimensions that are presented in table 1, table 2 was constructed. This part of the analysis apparatus makes it possible to analyze how the political parties and their representatives talk
about immigrants and minority groups. It furthermore makes it possible to do some kind of a comparison on how the parties frame immigrants and minority groups. In other words, it possibly enables me to find out whether one party possibly frames immigration as very threatening, while another party maybe frames immigration as a less threatful issue. Based on previous research, UKIP is expected to frame immigration as more threatening, while the Conservative Party is expected to frame immigration as less threatening. Table 3 presents where the parties are expected to be placed. Because of the fact that the parties are expected to frame immigration differently, two types of framing techniques are constructed (table 2). The ‘less threatening´ frame can for example refer to the framing of immigration as one issue among many other issues. The ‘more threatening´ frame rather refers to the framing of immigration as the main issue in society. Moreover, arguments and proposals that belong to the ‘less threatening´ frame can be described as less radical right. They can thus be interpreted as reflecting more mainstream/centre right (less negative) ideas about immigrants. Arguments and proposals that belong to the ‘more threatening´ frame can be defined as more radical right. They can thus be interpreted as reflecting radical right (more/very negative) ideas about immigrants.

Some examples of how the parties can frame immigration as less versus more threatening are presented in table 2. All these examples build upon the above mentioned arguments from previous research. A possible limitation with this part of the analysis apparatus is that it can be hard to know what frame an argument or proposal refers to. The operationalizations are however expected to help solve this possible problem and make it easier to know what frame the arguments and proposals refer to.
Table 2. Different ways of framing immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Two different framing techniques (operationalization)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less threatening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for labour market</td>
<td>'Immigration leads to low productivity, high unemployment rates and depressed wages. It must thus be controlled.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for public order, security and safety</td>
<td>'Crime rates are high among immigrant-dense areas, this can be solved by more police.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for public services</td>
<td>'Immigration puts high demands on the NHS and schools. This can be solved by control on immigration and more resources for public services.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for housing &amp; urban growth</td>
<td>'Immigration puts high demands on public housing. It must thus be controlled.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for values and culture</td>
<td>'Multicultural immigration and segregation threaten British values of the establishment of a cohesive and equalistic society.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. The expected use of frames by the Conservative Party and UKIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Two different framing techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less threatening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for labour market</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for public order, security &amp; safety</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for public services</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for housing &amp; urban growth</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for values and culture</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectations presented in table 3 are built upon previous studies arguing that the Conservative Party and UKIP have different focus on immigration. Helbling (2014:24) argued that far-right parties like UKIP often make use of frames that “include statements that express xenophobic attitudes that deplore the loss of unique national traditions and values, or that articulate a fear of ‘Islamisation’”. As argued by Widfeldt and Brandenburg (2018:597), UKIP is expected to have a very radical right approach on immigration. UKIP is thus expected to use a more hard-line rhetoric on immigration-related issues. Another study (Dennison & Goodwin, 2015:185) has argued that UKIP often argues about the destabilising effects of uncontrolled immigration and “putting the issue at the heart of a broader narrative about national loss, threat and abandonment, which was directed strongly to lower middle-class and working-class white Britons”. The Conservative Party is, on the other hand, expected to be less radical in its’ views on immigration. As argued by several previous studies (Alonso & da Fonseca, 2011; Bale, 2013; Partos & Bale, 2015), the Conservative Party is expected to have some similarities with a radical right party like UKIP. It is however also expected to not go “as far as radical right-wing populist parties now routinely go” (Bale, 2013:35). The Conservative Party is expected to propose less restriction on immigration, compared to UKIP that is expected to propose greater restrictions on immigration. Furthermore, Benson & Wood (2015:807) suggested a frame called ‘solution enforcement’
which refers to how politicians “deny immigrants opportunities for work, health care, education, or services so they will self-deport”. Since the Conservative Party is expected to be less radical right than UKIP, the Conservative Party is expected to propose less strict solutions while UKIP is expected to propose stricter solutions on how to control immigration. Previous studies have also argued that racist arguments are frequently used by far-right parties (Doerr, 2017; Hogan and Haltinner, 2015). These arguments are expected to be frequently used by UKIP and less frequently used by the Conservative Party.

The use of language is also expected to differ between the parties. As previous studies (Bale, 2013; Partos & Bale, 2015) have shown, radical right parties are expected to use a tougher language and a more hard-line rhetoric on immigration, while mainstream/centre right parties are expected to be less radical. Parties and party representatives that make use of the ‘less threatening’ frame are therefore expected to use a more ‘politically correct’ (less radical and tough) language, for example being more careful with using formulations that can be interpreted as discriminating towards a specific group depending on their faith or ethnicity. On the other hand, parties and representatives that use the ‘more threatening’ frame are expected to use a more tough language, for example more frequently using words and formulations that can be interpreted as discriminating to a group depending on their ethnicity or faith. Another difference between these two framing techniques is the choice of words. This is based on previous studies (Doerr, 2017; Hogan & Haltinner, 2015) arguing that far-right parties frequently use racist arguments when talking about immigration. Parties and party representatives that use the ‘less threatening’ frame might refer to an immigrant using the word immigrant, while parties and party representatives that use the ‘more threatening’ frame might refer to an immigrant using the word intruder. Parties and party representatives that use the ‘more threatening’ frame are more likely to use metaphors like invaders, intruders and parasites to describe immigrant groups. They are also more likely to use formulations that distinguish native borns to an unwelcome ‘foreign other’.

18
Material

This research includes different source of material. Official material from political parties (primarily party manifests) and newspaper articles have been collected in order to give a holistic answer to the outlined research question. Official material from the political parties have been selected as the primary source of material and newspaper articles have been selected as supplementary material. Within this research topic, only looking at official material is “way too narrow to consider corpus to reflect the discourse in question” (Bergström & Boréus, 2017:234). With the question of validity in mind, other types of material that says a lot about the discourse have been included. Newspaper articles have been chosen with the aim to work as complement to the official party material. A thing worth mentioning is that the two parties have released several manifests during the time-period between 2016-2019. When looking through the manifests from different years it was noticed that they have not changed a lot during this period of time. This is the reason for why only some of the manifests are included in this research.

Because of the fact that material from newspapers can be biased by political views and interests, it has been important to include newspapers that endorse different political parties and interests. While for example The Guardian, The Independent and BBC News are defined to be predominantly left-wing and centrist on a left-right political spectrum, newspapers like The Telegraph, The Sun and Financial Times are defined as broadly right-wing publications (Latham, 2013; McKee, 2017; Smith, 2017). This is however not a big issue since I, first and foremost, aim to look at newspaper articles including quotes from the parties and party representatives.

The material has been produced during 2016-2019. The party manifests have been downloaded from each party website and the newspaper articles were collected by searching for different keywords on the different newspaper websites, for example by searching for articles on ‘party name’ and different keywords such as immigration and the NHS, housing, culture, traditions and crime. In total, the Conservative Party has released two manifests and UKIP has released four manifests during this period of time. Since UKIP’s manifests are very similar, only two manifests will be presented in the analysis. The Conservative Party's

---

1 One manifesto from the Conservative Party is from 2015 and is used since the next manifesto was published in 2017.
Immigration Policy (Immigration Policy, 2019) and UKIP’s Integration Agenda (Tolhurst & Cole, 2017) are also included.

22 articles, 12 on the Conservative party and 10 on UKIP, has been selected as supplementary material. A lot more articles were found when searching on the different keywords. Many of these articles are however excluded from this paper since they do not include any quotes from the parties or party representatives, or because of the fact that many of them are debate articles. These articles are not of interest for this paper as this research aims to investigate the parties and party representatives approaches on immigration, and because of the fact that debate articles can be biased by political views and interests.

This thesis will also look closer at a couple of persons who have/have had great influence on Brexit and the immigration debate. It is however of great importance to view these persons as both representatives of political parties and as private persons. It is also important to be aware of that some of these persons are no longer party members. Nigel Farage is for example former UKIP leader and left the party in the end of 2018. Other influential persons that have been included are for example Boris Johnson, Theresa May and several UKIP party leaders. It seems to be of great relevance for this study to include these persons because of their great influence on the Brexit debate and since they have expressed their thoughts on immigration several times.
Empirics and Analysis

This part of the paper presents the empirics and analyses on the parties. The section is divided in three main sections, one for each party and lastly a comparative analysis of the two parties.

The Conservative Party

The Conservative Party is known for having an anti-immigrant approach. It is however not expected to be as radical right as UKIP is expected to be. The party is expected to focus a lot on economic arguments and proposals, for example on the attraction of high skilled immigrants and productivity. It is moreover expected to lean more towards using the ‘less-threatening’ frame rather than the ‘more-threatening’ frame. Previous studies (Alonso & da Fonseca, 2011; Bale, 2013; Partos & Bale, 2015) have shown how the Conservative Party balances between being mainstream/centre right and radical right. The party is thus expected to be somewhere in between - it is expected to be anti-immigrant, but not as far-right as for example UKIP. Based on more previous research (Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018; Kaufmann, 2018), the party is expected to have great focus on cultural threats. As the party balances between being mainstream and radical right in its’ views on immigration, arguments that are based on xenophobic, racist, islamophobic ideas are expected to occur.

Problems for the labour market

In the 2015 manifesto (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto, 2015) the Conservative Party proposed solutions on how to control immigration of low skilled workers. It is argued that low skilled immigration has led to increased unemployment.

To reduce the numbers of EU migrants coming to Britain, we will end the ability of EU jobseekers to claim any job-seeking benefits at all. And if jobseekers have not found a job within six months, they will be required to leave. We have already capped the level of skilled economic migration from outside the EU. We will maintain our cap at 20,700 during the next Parliament. This will ensure that we only grant visas to those who have the skills we really need in our economy. (Ibid:30)

David Cameron's government proposed tough rules on unemployed immigrants, suggesting that immigrants who did not find a job within six months should leave Britain. The government also suggested a £20,700 salary threshold in order to control the immigration of low skilled and low waged workers. As will be shown, the salary threshold on £20,700 is an
example of a less tough proposal on how to control immigration compared to the salary thresholds that have been proposed later on. Cameron’s government furthermore framed low skilled and low waged immigrants as problems for the labour market, at the same time as high skilled immigrants rather were framed as attractive for the British economy.

The 2017 manifesto (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto, 2017) from the Conservative Party makes it clear that the party wants to reduce and control immigration. The party wants to change the immigration system so that people who cross the borders to the UK have the skills that the UK needs (Ibid:20). The party will therefore “continue to bear down on immigration from outside the European Union” (Ibid:54). It will also “establish an immigration policy that allows us to reduce and control the number of people who come to Britain from the European Union, while still allowing us to attract the skilled workers our economy needs” (Ibid:55). The party's immigration policy “means keeping immigration under control, while allowing high skilled migration into the country” (Immigration Policy, 2019). It means that an Australian-style skill-based immigration system should be put in place, only attracting the best and brightest that have the skills that the British economy needs. This immigration policy is further promised to both control immigration, attract the people that the UK needs, as well as keep the country safe.

In the Immigration Policy published on the Conservative Party's website, the party argues that Labour's immigration policy makes Britain unsafe (Immigration Policy, 2019).

Labour want to remove immigration caps – meaning a Labour government would let anyone enter the country. Whether our economy needed them or not. Only the Conservative’s immigration policy will keep our country safe and attract the best and brightest international graduates. Labour would simply make the same mistakes of the past and cause more economic chaos. (Ibid)

It is argued that Labour does not want to control immigration or end the freedom of movement. Such a policy lets “anyone enter the country” and makes Britain unsafe. This section of the immigration policy is to a large extent dedicated to economic safety and that letting anyone into Britain causes economic chaos.

Before Boris Johnson became prime minister, May's government proposed strict immigration rules and a £30,000 salary threshold for immigrants wanting to move and work in the UK (Kentish, 2019: Skapinker, 2019). The proposed £30,000 salary threshold has
worried many employers, for example within healthcare. It also discriminates people who seek low waged jobs. May has said that “applicants will need to meet a minimum salary threshold to ensure they are not competing for jobs that could otherwise be recruited in the UK” and that “successful applicants for high skilled work would be able to bring their immediate family but only if sponsored by their future employers” (McTague, 2018). The problem is thus that this proposed system discriminates low skilled immigrants and immigrants who seek to apply to low waged jobs.

As recently as in september 2019, Iain Duncan Smith, former leader of the Conservative Party and “co-founder of the Centre for Social Justice, urged Priti Patel, the home secretary, to raise the minimum salary threshold for immigrants from £30,000 to £36,700 per year” (Abgarian, 2019: Hall, 2019). Because of the fact that the median annual income in the UK is £28,677 and because of what message these proposals send to low skilled immigrants and low waged workers, these proposals are discriminating low skilled and low waged people. It can possibly send a message of that the best and brightest and the ones who can contribute to the British economy are those who earn a certain amount of money. Those who have wages beneath the threshold are not as attractive even though such workforce is very much needed for the British economy. While the best and brightest are very welcome to the UK, low skilled and low paid immigrants are not welcome at all. All these arguments about only allowing high skilled people who earn a certain amount, whilst not allowing people who are low skilled and low waged, can be referred to the framing of immigrants as either benefits or burdens for the economy. Low skilled and low waged immigrants are framed as problems for the economy, for example framed as economic problems in the sense that they contribute to increased unemployment within low skilled and low waged sectors such as the NHS. High skilled immigrants are rather seen as great benefits for the UK since they can contribute to the country's productivity and international competition.

In contrast to arguments that seem to benefit high waged immigrants and hinder low waged immigrants, the Conservative Party recently promised to make it easier for foreign doctors and nurses to work in the UK (Pym, 2019: Cordon, 2019: Mason, 2019). If the Conservative Party wins the general election in december 2019, the party has promised to introduce a 'NHS visa' as a part of the Australian-style points-based system. Foreign doctors and nurses will also be able to get a visa for only £464, instead of paying £928. The party is
also considering to abolish the £30,000 minimum salary threshold for skilled immigrants that seek long-term visas.

To summarize this section, the Conservative Party puts great focus on framing immigrants as either benefits or problems for the economy. Their proposals and arguments about immigration and its effects on the labour market focus a lot on describing immigrants as either wanted or unwanted. As mentioned, high skilled immigrants are very welcome to the UK as they can contribute to the economic productivity. Low skilled and low waged immigrants are not wanted at all, unless they can work within healthcare. A clear example of how the party wants to control low skilled immigration even more during the last couple of years is how the salary threshold has increased from £20,700 to £30,000, and how it possibly will increase to £36,700. The party has thus toughened up their solutions on how to control low skilled immigration during the past few years. This can be interpreted as if the party has moved towards more radical right ideas on how to control the immigration of low skilled and low waged workers which is framed as very problematic for the labour market.

Furthermore, the proposals and arguments about immigration and its effects on the labour market seem to lean towards the ‘more threatening’ frame. Their proposals and arguments on how immigration affects the labour market frames immigration as a big problem that can only be solved by quite hard rules and controls. Immigrants are framed as big problems for the labour market, possibly as the main factor causing increased unemployment rates and depressed wages. It becomes clear that the party has quite negative attitudes about immigrants. The party can thus be described as leaning towards radical right ideas. This is because of how immigration is framed as a great issue and because of how the party proposes quite harsh rules on how to control immigration-related issues.

Problems for public order, security and safety

The Conservative Party does not, in their 2017 Manifesto, explicitly express that immigration and immigrants are threats against national security and safety. One section in the Manifesto is however dedicated to extremism (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto, 2017:55). It is argued that “extremism, especially Islamist extremism, [...] undermines the cohesion of our society and can fuel violence”. Immigrants are not explicitly framed as threats against national security and safety, but extremist immigrant groups such as Islamic extremists are framed as fuelling violence within Britain. Of all extremist groups that fuel
violence, Islamic extremist groups are the only groups that are explicitly framed as threatening against the national security and safety.

In the Immigration Policy that is published on the Conservative Party's website, the party argues that Labour's immigration policy makes Britain unsafe (Immigration Policy, 2019). It is argued that Labour does not want to control immigration or end the freedom of movement, and that such a policy lets “anyone enter the country” and makes Britain unsafe. Uncontrolled and unsustainable immigration is thus framed as a threat against national safety and security.

The Conservative Party seems to put quite little focus on framing immigration as a security threat. Extremism, particularly Islamist extremism, is framed as a security threat and immigration in general is vaguely framed as a threat against national safety and security. It is however quite unclear in what kind of way immigration threatens the national safety and security. The only clear arguments on how immigration threatens safety and security is pronounced in the manifesto where it is argued that uncontrolled immigration of (extremist) muslims makes Britain more threatened by Islamic extremism and violent actions. Because of the little focus on immigration and muslims as threats against security and safety, it is possible to argue that the Conservative Party uses the so called ‘less threatening’ frame when framing immigrants as safety and security threats. The party can be defined as leaning towards more mainstream/centre right ideas on this specific issue. This is mainly because of the fact that immigration is not framed as a great security and safety problem, and since the only immigrant groups that are explicitly argued to be issues for national security and safety are muslim extremist groups.

**Problems for culture and values**

In the 2017 manifesto, the Conservative Party expresses that the party is very pro cultural diversity, but that one important job for the government is to confront extremism that threatens society in several ways (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto, 2017:55). “Extremism, especially Islamist extremism, strips some British people, especially women, of the freedoms they should enjoy.”

Members of the Conservative Party have been accused for being racist and islamophobic because of several statements. Boris Johnson’s “comparison of burqa-wearing Muslim women to bank robbers and letter boxes” is just one such incident (Woodcock,
Johnson has written that he is against bans on face-covering veils in public places (Johnson, 2018), but then also made it clear what he actually thinks about the veils:

If you tell me that the burqa is oppressive, then I am with you. If you say that it is weird and bullying to expect women to cover their faces, then I totally agree[...] I would go further and say that it is absolutely ridiculous that people should choose to go around looking like letter boxes[...] I am against a total ban because it is inevitably construed – rightly or wrongly – as being intended to make some point about Islam. If a constituent came to my MP’s surgery with her face obscured, I should feel fully entitled [...] to ask her to remove it so that I could talk to her properly. If a female student turned up at school or at a university lecture looking like a bank robber then ditto: those in authority should be allowed to converse openly with those that they are being asked to instruct. (Ibid)

Johnson was very clear on that he was against a total ban, but also said some quite controversial things about women who choose to wear burqas. He calls these women ridiculous, that they are looking like letter boxes and bank robbers. Later on he also added that face covering veils are “odd bits of headgear” (Ibid). He was furthermore open for that individual branches and businesses of government should be able to enforce dress codes that enable interaction between employees and customers; “and that means human beings must be able to see each other’s faces and read their expressions”. He further writes that he is against a total ban since such a proposal would “risk turning people into martyrs, and you risk a general crackdown on any public symbols of religious affiliation, and you may simply make the problem worse”. As said by Theresa May’s spokesperson, a total ban is not in line with “British values of religious tolerance and gender equality” (Clark, 2018). By the discussion on face covering veils, the Conservative Party seems to be keen about keeping British values and religious freedom. Some of the words and metaphors that are used can however be referred to as being based on islamophobic ideas.

Other islamophobic incidents within the party have ranged from Islamophobic posts by Conservative members, to individuals ‘liking’ anti-Muslim pictures or statements (Forsyth, 2019). One such incident is when a Conservative councillor responded to a tweet by writing “Islam and slavery are partners in crime”. Another incident is when an “independent parish councillor, who stated he had worked on Boris Johnson's 2012 Mayoral campaign, posted: ‘Islam is THE religion of hate (sic)’ and ‘Muslims hate = free speech (sic).’”
The Conservative Party does not frame immigration in general as a threat against British culture and values. The party puts some focus on how the Muslim faith counters British values and culture in their official material. Because of how the party defines the problems with extremism and Islamic extremism in particular, it could be argued that the party makes use of the ‘less threatening’ frame in the manifesto. The only sentence in the manifesto on how extremism threatens British culture and values is the following: “Extremism, especially Islamist extremism, strips some British people, especially women, of the freedoms they should enjoy” (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto, 2017:55). As interpreted from the manifesto, the party does not seem to think that immigration is a great threat against British culture and values.

However, party leader Boris Johnson and other party members have framed Islam as a great threat against British culture and values. These party members put great focus on the cultural incompatibility between Islam and British culture and fundamental values such as democracy, equality and freedom. They use much tougher formulations when defining Islam as a great threat and are thus making use of a more radical right language. When looking at the different quotes presented in this section it is however hard to interpret these as examples of how party members make use of the ‘more threatening’ frame. This is because of the fact that Islam is here defined as a threat against British culture and fundamental values, but it stays unclear how big of a threat Islam is for Britain. They can however be interpreted as leaning towards the ‘more threatening’ frame because of how Islam is framed as a religion that counters British fundamental values such as freedom of speech and equality between the sexes. It is furthermore very clear how these quotes are examples of the use of a more radical right language. Boris Johnson makes use of metaphors like letter boxes and bank robbers when describing Muslim women wearing burqas (Johnson, 2018). He also says that it is absolutely ridiculous that these women choose to cover their faces and that the face covering veils are “odd bits of headgear”. The quotations “Islam and slavery are partners in crime” and “Islam is THE religion of hate (sic)’ and ‘Muslims hate = free speech (sic)” can be interpreted as other examples of quotes that are based on radical right ideas about immigrants and Muslims.

In sum, it can be argued that the party leans towards using the ‘more threatening’ frame more often than they use the ‘less threatening’ frame. This is mainly because of the fact that the party and many party members are negative towards the immigration of Muslims and
their ways of living. They put no focus on immigration in general, but are very keen about discussing the problems with the immigration of muslims. Since the party puts very little focus on problems for culture and values in their manifesto, it can be argued that the party makes greater use of the `less threatening´ frame. Many party representatives have however framed (muslim) immigration as a great issue for British culture and values. These findings can thus suggest that the party leans towards using the `more threatening´ frame since their arguments and proposals reflect very negative ideas about, in particular, muslims.

Problems for public services

In the 2015 manifesto (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto, 2015:30), the Conservative Party further framed low skilled and low waged immigrants as a great issue since they move to Britain to claim advantages such as child benefits.

We will insist that EU migrants who want to claim tax credits and child benefit must live here and contribute to our country for a minimum of four years. This will reduce the financial incentive for lower-paid, lower-skilled workers to come to Britain[...] If an EU migrant’s child is living abroad, then they should receive no child benefit or child tax credit, no matter how long they have worked in the UK and no matter how much tax they have paid. (Ibid)

Low skilled and low waged immigrants are once again framed as problematic since they are assumed to move to Britain since it is easy to claim benefits from public services. These immigrants are framed as moving here to claim tax credits and child benefits. The proposed solution is that immigrants have to live, work and pay taxes for five years before being able to claim benefits from public services. This proposal makes it really hard for low skilled and low waged immigrants to immigrate to Britain since they might not afford living in Britain during the five years that they cannot claim any benefits from public services.

This proposal can be interpreted as if the Conservative Party leans towards using the `more threatening´ frame when framing immigration as a problem for public services. This is because of the fact that the party suggests a quite tough solution on how to control the immigrants that are framed as causing problems because of how they abuse public service benefits. This problem is not mentioned in the 2017 manifesto, which could be due to the fact that the party does not frame it as a big problem anymore. This could possibly be explained by the occurrence of other problems taking the attention from former problems or since the
increased salary threshold has solved the problem with low skilled and low waged immigrants claiming undeserved benefits from public services. Either way, this is also an example of a proposal that reflects how the Conservative Party has radical right and negative ideas about low skilled and low waged immigrants that are framed as taking advantages of public services without contributing to the society by paying taxes for a certain amount of time.

Problems for housing and urban growth

In the 2015 manifesto (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto, 2015:30), the Conservative Party argued that the party wanted to “introduce a new residency requirement for social housing, so that EU migrants cannot even be considered for a council house unless they have been living in an area for at least four years”. This proposal can be interpreted as if immigrants were taking advantages of public housing which might create problems for natives that want to rent public housing. This proposal makes it very hard for low waged immigrants to immigrate and integrate to the UK. This is because of the fact that public housing is cheaper to rent compared to for example private housing. The access to public housing is thus very important for low waged residents and immigrants that wants to ‘put down roots’ in a specific area (Shelter, 2019).

Since this proposal suggests a quite tough solution on how to control low waged immigrants, it can be interpreted that the Conservative Party leans towards using the ‘more threatening’ frame when framing immigration as a problem for housing. This problem is also not mentioned in the 2017 manifesto, which could be explained by the fact that the party does not frame it as a big problem anymore. This could possibly be due to the fact that other problems have occurred taking the attention from former problems, or as an effect of that the increased salary threshold has solved the problem with low skilled and low waged immigrants claiming undeserved benefits from the welfare system. Either way, this is an example of a proposal that reflects how the party has radical right and negative ideas about low skilled and low waged immigrants that are framed as taking undeserved advantages of the welfare system.

Summary of the empirics and analysis on the Conservative Party

The analysis on the Conservative Party shows how the party frames immigration as a great issue threatening the labour market, British culture and values, public order, national security
and safety, public services and housing. As expected, the party focuses heavily on economic arguments and proposals focusing on attracting high skilled immigrants and increasing the national productivity. Low skilled and low paid immigrants are at the same time framed as a burden for the British economy, and are thus not as welcome as high skilled immigrants are. As also expected, the party puts some focus on framing immigration as a cultural threat. Arguments about cultural threats are however more often occurring in the material on party representatives than in the party's manifesto.

It furthermore becomes evident that the party balances between using the 'less threatening' frame and the 'more threatening' frame when arguing about immigration-related issues. The analysis however suggests that the party leans more towards using the 'more threatening' frame. Because of the fact that the party is argued to balance between being mainstream and being radical right in its' views on immigration, arguments that are based on racist, xenophobic and islamophobic ideas were expected to occur. This becomes evident by how party representatives argue about immigration. Although xenophobic, racist and islamophobic arguments are quite rarely used, the analysis shows how the party and party representatives frequently use arguments that are based on very negative and radical right ideas about immigrants. In sum, the party can be defined as balancing between being mainstream/centre right and radical right when framing immigration, most often leaning closer to being radical right in its’ opinions on immigration.

**UKIP**

UKIP is known for having a far right anti immigration approach. Based on previous research (Helbling, 2013), UKIP is expected to focus on arguments about social security and labour. UKIP is furthermore expected to be more radical right in its’ approach on immigration using a more hard-line rhetoric on the issue. The party is expected to lean more towards using the 'more threatening' frame rather than the 'less threatening' frame. Based on other previous studies (Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018; Kaufmann, 2018), UKIP is also expected to focus heavily on cultural threats. Compared to the Conservative Party, UKIP is for example expected to have a greater focus on protecting the nation from muslim immigration as an effect of growing worries about cultural incompatibility. The party is also expected to frequently use xenophobic, racist and islamophobic arguments.
**Problems for the labour market**

In UKIP’s 2018 manifesto (United Kingdom Independence Party Interim Manifesto, 2018:4) it is stated that “mass uncontrolled immigration has been extremely damaging to Britain”. UKIP further argues that the UK have imported way too much cheap labour, which “not only exploits migrants but depresses the wages and living standards of those at the bottom end of the economic scale”. The main solution to this problem is to establish an Australian-style points-based immigration system, just like the system that the Conservatives propose. UKIP has put some focus on how such a system would work out in order to attract the best and brightest to the UK. The main focus is however put on arguing about how damaging mass uncontrolled immigration has been for the British economy. In the manifesto, immigration is framed as the main reason for why unemployment increases, and why wages and living standards are depressed. Mass uncontrolled immigration is especially defined as the main issue for the increased levels of unemployment, in particular among working class people (United Kingdom Independence Party Manifesto, 2017:33).

Because of the fact that immigration is defined as the main issue for the labour market leading to unemployment among working class people, it can be interpreted as if UKIP makes use of the ‘more threatening’ frame. The language can be best described as leaning towards being more radical right. This is because of how the arguments and proposals reflect the party’s radical right ideas on how immigration is extremely damaging and that it should therefore be heavily restricted.

**Problems for public order, security and safety**

Islamic extremism is mentioned in the 2018 manifesto and is followed by four possible solutions to this problem (United Kingdom Independence Party Interim Manifesto, 2018:14). One of the points is that UKIP plans on “banning the overseas funding of mosques and imams”. It is argued that many of the mosques in the UK “are funded from countries such as Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, who export their extremist ideology to the UK”. Another solution is that UKIP wants to end uncontrolled immigration, and under a security-based screening policy restrict migration from Islamic countries “to those people we can be sure, as far as possible, do not follow a literalist and extremist interpretation of Islam”.

Before the general election in 2017, UKIP launched its’ Integration Agenda. UKIP presented that the party wanted to ban the wearing of face covering veils in public places,
arguing that the wearing of face coverings is “a deliberate barrier to integration and in many contexts, a security risk too” (Tolhurst & Cole, 2017). Another proposal was about the abolishment of postal voting on demand.

Abolish postal voting on demand and return to a higher threshold of demonstrable need before a postal vote is granted. Postal votes on demand have led to a boom in electoral fraud and vote-stealing, especially among minority communities. (Ibid)

The Integration Agenda is a set of proposals on how to restrict Muslims and keep the public order safe from threatful groups of people and their ideas. Muslims are framed as the main problem for the public order, and national security and safety. Immigrants and minority groups are also framed as problems for the public order because of how vote-stealing and electoral fraud are argued to be common problems among minority communities.

Nigel Farage is one of the most important politicians on the pro-Leave side. As the leader of UKIP between 2010-2016 and then as party member until December 2018, he has had a large impact on the Brexit debate and on anti-immigrant views. During his time as party member, he has said several things that can be interpreted as xenophobic and racist. Farage has said that “Malmö in Sweden is the rape capital of Europe due to EU migrant policies. Anyone who says there isn’t a problem is lying to you” (Lusher, 2017). He has furthermore said that “Pro-rata Sweden has taken more young, male migrants than any other country in Europe and there has been a dramatic rise in sexual crime in Sweden, so much so that Malmö is now the rape capital of Europe” (BBC News, 2017). He has also tweeted a picture of a woman holding a sign that says “My legs are open for refugees” (Harris, 2018; Kretzel, 2018). The picture was followed by a text that says “What an insult to the victims of sexual abuse in Cologne and rape in Malmö. These people are sick”.

Gerard Batten took over as UKIP’s party leader between 2018-2019. In his first interview since he took over from former party leader Henry Bolton, Batten said a couple of anti-Islam comments (Gye, 2018b). He said that British Muslims should sign a document that rejects the teaching of the Koran since Islam “glorifies death” - Muslims “believe in propagating their religion by martyring themselves”. He stated that it is “factually and historically true” that Islam is a “death cult” strongly related to violence. He proposed that the building of new mosques should be banned and that extremist mosques and imams should not be allowed to be funded by foreign money. He also added that “I don't think it's unreasonable
to say that people who come and live in our country should reject those Dark Age ideologies which some of them bring with them”. He has later on said that the muslim faith is “propagated by invasion, by violence and intimidation”, and added that muslims should “formally renounce the beliefs stated in the Koran” (Gye, 2018a).

Richard Braine was elected as UKIP’s party leader in mid 2019. He has argued that it should be illegal to distribute the Koran in public in the UK, and that some areas in British towns are places you should not go to unless you are a muslim (Walker, 2019). He argued that it should be illegal to hand out copies of the Koran, and that such a crime should be under laws connected to incitement on violence.

We have laws against incitement, and yet there are people handing out the Koran in Leicester Square off a trestle table – a book which tells people to kill us to please God. We’ve got to stop incitement in public places like that. We’ve got to stop bigamy, welfare abuse. We’ve got to educate people in this country so they understand what the Koran says, what Islam really is, so they understand that it contains a hundred instructions to maim and slaughter innocent people – homosexuals, the infidel, women, apostates. So we need to understand what is in that book, we need to educate ourselves and our children about that. (Ibid)

UKIP's manifesto, three party leaders and UKIP’s former education spokesperson have all framed mass immigration and the muslim faith as threats against national security and safety. Mass immigration is for example framed as a phenomenon that is strongly correlated to increased levels of rape, as argued by former party leader Farage (Lusher, 2017; BBC News, 2017; Harris, 2018; Kretzel, 2018). Islam is furthermore framed as a religion causing several other societal issues. It is for example framed as a religion that fuels violent behaviour, as argued in the 2017 and 2018 manifesto, and by former party leader Batten and current party leader Braine (Gye, 2018a; Gye, 2018b; Walker, 2019).

To summarize, UKIP frames Islam as a great threat against the public order, and national security and safety. Throughout the 2018 manifesto and the 2017 Integration Agenda, UKIP focuses heavily on problematizing immigration and arguing about problems that are caused by immigrants from muslim-majority countries. Muslims, and Islamic extremists in particular, are framed as great threats against the public order, and national safety and security. The party further makes it clear that it is ready to establish tougher laws in order to
hinder Islamic extremism from striking roots. In the Integration Agenda, UKIP presented further proposals on how to restrict Muslims. Both Muslims and minority communities (such as groups of people from Asian, African and Muslim-majority countries) are framed as the main issues causing security risks, and electoral fraud and vote-stealing. Because of how the party puts great focus on immigrants, especially on Muslim immigrants, the arguments and proposals presented in the official party material can be interpreted as examples of how UKIP makes use of the ‘more threatening’ frame within the debate on immigration and threats against the public order, and national security and safety. The language can furthermore be interpreted as an example of how UKIP’s arguments and proposals are based on radical right and very negative ideas about immigrants.

Party members have also made use of the ‘more threatening’ frame and a more radical right type of language when framing immigrants. Their main focus is on Muslim immigrants that are framed as great threats against national safety and security. Former party leader Nigel Farage argued that the rise of sexual crimes is because of mass uncontrolled immigration of young men. Other party members such as former party leader Gerard Batten and current party leader Richard Braine have also framed Muslims as great security and safety threats. Islam is described as a religion that fuels violent behaviour and that is “propagated by invasion, by violence and intimidation” (Gye, 2018a). These quotes can be interpreted as examples of how party members make use of a more radical right language when framing immigration. This is due to the fact that immigration is argued to be strongly related to specific issues such as sexual crimes, violent behaviour and intimidation. It is also because of how the sentences include words that for example refer to how immigrants are ‘invading’ Britain and taking over certain areas.

Problems for culture and values

In UKIP’s Integration Agenda that was launched before the general election in 2017, the party presented a couple of points on how to control immigration and keep Britain safe from incompatible cultures like Islam (Tolhurst & Cole, 2017). It was presented that UKIP wanted to block the opening of Muslim schools and ban Sharia, which is argued to be “a rival legal system and which undermines women's rights”. UKIP also promised a “moratorium on new Islamic faith schools until substantial progress has been demonstrated in integrating Muslims into mainstream British society”. UKIP’s education spokesman, David Kurten, further
proposed the “suspension of existing schools with 'extreme uniform requirements' relating to Islam, like veils”.

Henry Bolton, former UKIP leader, has argued that “the weight of immigration and the rise of Islam is leading to British culture being 'buried’” (Tolhurst, 2017). British culture, traditions and values are being harmed by uncontrolled immigration and the rise of Islam. In other words, a culturally diverse society is defined as harming British culture and identity, and muslims are framed as the group of people harming British culture and values the most. The statement by Bolton frame Islam and muslims as threats against British culture and values. Islam and muslims are for example framed as threats against the creation of a national identity and cohesive society, as well as threats against fundamental British values such as equality between the sexes. It is for example argued that British towns and cities are divided in muslim and non-muslim areas. This was also said by Richard Braine, current party leader, who mentioned the issue of “towns and cities becoming increasingly Islamic to the point where essentially, as a non-Islamic person, you’re simply not welcome there. And we’ve got to stop that” (Walker, 2019).

In sum, muslim immigrants are framed as great problems since the muslim faith and muslims’ ways of living are incompatible with British culture and values. British fundamental values such as equality between the sexes are for example threatened by muslims due to the fact that the muslim faith is argued to undermine women's rights (Tolhurst & Cole, 2017). Because of the focus on muslims as the main issue for the ‘burial’ of British culture and since the muslim faith is argued to be incompatible with British values, UKIP makes use of the ‘more threatening’ frame within this debate. Furthermore, a quite tough language is used both within the Integration Agenda and within the quotes from the party representatives. While the language in the Integration Agenda can be interpreted as leaning towards being more radical right, the language used by the party representatives can be interpreted as being more radical right. This is due to the fact that the language in the Integration Agenda is more formal and politically correct, while the language used by the party representatives builds upon of another type of language. “The rise of Islam is leading to British culture being buried” can for example be interpreted as a quite harsh formulation referring to how muslims are invading and Islamizing Britain.
Problems for public services

Another section in the 2018 Manifesto discusses the NHS policy in England. It is argued that the NHS is in crisis, which is partially a problem caused by mass immigration and a high demand on health services (United Kingdom Independence Party Interim Manifesto, 2018:2).

EU open borders have created a major drain on resources by bringing in around 3.8 million additional people. Many of these people will have no history of contributing significant tax revenue to help pay for the NHS but have the same entitlement as British citizens. When Britain leaves the EU, this entitlement must not be extended to any new arrivals from the EU. (Ibid)

Another solution to this problem is presented later in the Manifesto, proposing that migrants will be unable to claim any benefits until they have been tax paying residents in UK for five years (Ibid:4). Immigrants will, after five years of continuously living in the UK and paying taxes, be able to claim the same benefits as British residents. Immigrants will also “be expected to possess private health insurance as a condition of entry to the UK”.

In his first speech at the party’s Torquay conference in 2017, former leader Henry Bolton said that “Immigration is overwhelming our public services, which themselves are being slashed – 25% off the police, for example, in some cases nearly 50% off local government” (Grierson, 2017).

UKIP frames immigration as one of the main issues causing problems for the NHS. Immigration is framed as being out of control and the NHS is argued to be “open to widespread abuse by non-UK citizens” (United Kingdom Independence Party Interim Manifesto, 2018:2). Some other explanations, that are not related to immigration, on why the NHS is in crisis are however also presented. The framing of immigration within this debate could thus be interpreted as an example of how UKIP leans towards using the ‘less threatening’ frame. However, there are also signs on how UKIP uses the ‘more threatening’ frame. This is due of the fact that it becomes evident that UKIP frames poorer immigrants as more threatening against the NHS. Their proposal on expecting immigrants to have private health insurances when immigrating to the UK is an example of a quite strict rule that aims to hinder those immigrants that are seen as a burden for the NHS. In sum, it becomes evident that UKIP leans towards using the ‘more threatening’ frame since the party's arguments and proposals reflect more radical right ideas on immigration.
Problems for housing and urban growth

In UKIP's 2018 Manifesto (United Kingdom Independence Party Interim Manifesto, 2018:4) it is argued that the UK have imported way too much cheap labour which “drives up property prices and rental costs”. The very high demand on housing is another problem caused by mass uncontrolled immigration (United Kingdom Independence Party Interim Manifesto, 2018:4). It is argued that the “UK does not have a housing problem - it has a demand problem, with demand being fuelled by mass uncontrolled immigration”. Mass uncontrolled immigration is also argued to be one of the main problems causing environmental changes in England. The Green Belt, a policy for controlling urban growth, and UK environment in general is threatened by “unsustainable population growth, which is predominantly fuelled by mass uncontrolled immigration” (Ibid:11).

It is also argued that “immigrants from the European Union have enjoyed access to social housing on the same basis as British citizens” (Ibid:4). UKIP further promises to end this problem by introducing “a five-year residency qualification for any non-UK citizen buyer of residential property in designated areas in England”. This proposal stops the problem with low waged and poorer immigrants buying residential properties, as well as stops the problem with low waged immigrants competing against low waged British residents on cheaper residential properties. It is also mentioned that the government will try to stop rich foreigners trying to find loopholes within such a system, the plan on how to do this is however unpronounced. Another proposal on how to stop the housing problem is that migrants should be unable to claim public housing “until they have been a tax paying resident in UK for a continuous five years” (Ibid). Public housing is cheaper to rent compared to for example private housing, and is thus very important for low waged residents and immigrants that wants to ‘put down roots’ in a specific area (Shelter, 2019). This proposal makes it even harder for low waged immigrants to immigrate and integrate to the UK. These two proposals restrict the opportunities for low waged and poorer immigrants to get a residential property and settle down within the UK. It is however unspoken how UKIP plans to stop rich immigrants from going around the system. In sum, the arguments and proposals on how to stop housing problems are primarily restricting low waged and poorer immigrants from getting residential properties, while rich immigrants are more or less unaffected. These
proposals can thus refer to how poorer and low waged immigrants are being viewed as great problems for housing.

Since immigration is framed as the main issue for housing and urban growth in the UK, it can be interpreted as if UKIP uses the ‘more threatening’ frame within this debate. The party's arguments and proposals can be interpreted as being based on more radical right ideas. This is due to the fact that the proposals and arguments show that how party has radical right and very negative ideas about immigrants and on how to control them.

**Summary of the empirics and analysis on UKIP**

The analysis on UKIP shows how the party frames immigration as the main factor causing many issues in Britain. Immigration is argued to be threatening against the labour market, public services, housing and urban growth, British culture and values, and national security and safety. UKIP seems to focus almost equally much on all mentioned debates. Security and safety is however the issue discussed the most. It can therefore be argued that the expectation on that the party should focus mostly on arguments about social security and labour partly holds. UKIP was also expected to focus heavily on cultural threats and to have a great focus on protecting the nation from muslim immigration as an effect of growing worries about cultural incompatibility. The focus on immigration and cultural threats is not as big as expected, but the analysis still shows that some arguments and proposals focus on how problematic the muslim faith and muslims’ ways of living are for the UK. The focus on how damaging the immigration of muslims is for the UK is seen within several of the above-mentioned debates.

As shown, UKIP makes great use of the ‘more threatening’ frame, often claiming that immigration is the main issue for the UK. The party representatives also seem to make use of a more radical right language. Moreover, the arguments and proposals often mirror radical right and very negative ideas about immigrants. As also expected, the party seems to have especially negative ideas about muslims. Although the party and party representatives quite rarely make use of xenophobic, racist and islamophobic arguments, it becomes evident that the party has very negative and radical right ideas about immigrants.
Comparative Analysis

Table 4 shows how the two parties make use of the two framing techniques when framing immigration. As expected, UKIP makes great use of the ‘more threatening’ frame. This is due to the fact that the party's arguments and proposals frequently reflect radical right and very negative ideas about immigrants. Unexpected but not surprisingly, the analysis has shown that the Conservative Party also makes great use of the ‘more threatening’ frame. This is due to the fact that the party, just like UKIP, often makes use of arguments and proposals reflecting negative and radical right ideas about immigrants. The following comparative analysis will compare the two parties and their approaches on immigration.

Table 4. The parties use of frames

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>Two different framing techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less threatening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for labour market</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for public order, security &amp; safety</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for public services</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for housing &amp; urban growth</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems for values and culture</td>
<td>The Conservative Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Problems for labour market**

The Conservative Party puts great focus on how immigration of high skilled workers can benefit the productivity, at the same time as low skilled immigrants rather are framed as a great burden decreasing wages and causing high unemployment rates. UKIP also focuses on how damaging the immigration of low skilled workers has been for Britain. It is argued that immigration has depressed wages and living standards for many native borns. Both parties suggest an Australian-style points-based system to solve immigration-related issues for the
labour market. However, in contrast to how the Conservative Party has put great focus on how such a system would work out, UKIP quickly suggests the system as a solution and rather continues with discussing how immigration is extremely damaging for Britain. Both parties are, even though they argue differently about the issue, making use of arguments and proposals that reflect radical right ideas about immigration and on how to control it. This is mainly due of the fact that both parties frame immigration as a great issue for the labour market. It is also since they suggest quite tough solutions on how to restrict and control immigration in order to secure the labour market for native-born workers.

When it comes to the framing of immigration as a problem for the labour market, the two parties seem to share opinions on how damaging immigration can be. Both the Conservative Party and UKIP are very keen about securing the labour market for natives and only attracting the skills that Britain needs. Both parties also use the same type of harsh formulations when framing immigration as a problem for the labour market. The language is very formal even though it also can be described as quite harsh. There are however no examples of how the parties make use of a very radical right type of language within this specific debate on how immigration threatens the labour market. In sum, it becomes obvious that both parties make use of the ‘more threatening’ frame when framing immigration as a problem for the labour market.

Problems for public order, security and safety

UKIP frames immigrants as great problems for the public order, security and safety. Their main focus is on how muslims are a security risk and how the muslim faith fuels violence. Party representatives have also framed immigrants as great security risks by for example arguing that male immigrants are very likely to commit sexual crimes and by framing muslim immigrants as a very dangerous group of people. UKIP also proposes quite strict rules on how to control these problems, for example suggesting stricter rules on muslims in order to hinder Islamic extremism from striking roots. One example of such a strict solution is the proposal to use a security-based screening policy for being able to control immigrants from Islamic countries (United Kingdom Independence Party Interim Manifesto, 2018:14). The Conservative Party, on the other hand, does not seem to put as great focus on these issues. The party briefly mentions the problem with Islamist extremism undermining the cohesion of the British society and how it fuels violence (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto,
The Conservative Party also very shortly mentions how Labour's immigration policy lets “anyone enter the country” and makes Britain unsafe (Immigration Policy, 2019).

Furthermore, party representatives of UKIP have described Islam as a ‘death cult’ and as ‘glorifying death’ (Gye, 2018b). Muslims have been accused for being strongly related to invasion, violence and intimidation. Another example is when former party leader Nigel Farage argued that young male immigrants are the reason for why Malmö and Cologne have great problems with sexual crimes (BBC News, 2017; Lusher, 2017). He also made use of a picture of a woman holding a sign saying “My legs are open for refugees” and then wrote; “What an insult to the victims of sexual abuse in Cologne and rape in Malmö. These people are sick”. As expected, party representatives of UKIP have more frequently made use of harsh formulations. There are no similar examples of how members of the Conservative Party have framed immigration as very problematic for the public order, security and safety.

There is a striking difference in how the two parties frame immigration as a problem for public order, security and safety. This is the issue where the parties differ the most. While UKIP, as expected, seems to have very radical right ideas on how immigrants are strongly linked to crime, the Conservative Party does not seem to view immigration as a great security risk. This is why I argue that the Conservative Party makes use of the ‘less threatening’ frame on this issue, while UKIP rather makes use of the ‘more threatening’ frame. The Conservative Party's approach to this issue reflects more mainstream/centre right (less negative) ideas on immigration, at the same time as UKIP’s approach reflects radical right and very negative ideas about immigration. It has also become clear that party representatives of UKIP have frequently made use of a radical right language when framing these issues.

Problems for culture and values

Both the Conservative Party and UKIP argue that multicultural immigration threatens British culture and values. The main focus is put on how muslims and their ways of living counter British traditions and fundamental values such as equality between the sexes. The only difference between the parties on this specific issue is that UKIP puts more focus on suggesting solutions on how to restrict the establishment of Islam within the British society.

There are some examples of when party representatives of the Conservative Party have made use of a radical right language that reflects racist, xenophobic and islamophobic ideas. Boris Johnson has, in his own article for The Telegraph, wrote that burqa wearing
women look like letter boxes and bank robbers, and that burqas are “odd bits of headgear” (Johnson, 2018). He also wrote that these women are absolutely ridiculous for choosing to cover their faces. Other party members have linked Islam to slavery and described Islam as “THE religion of hate” (Forsyth, 2019). Saying that burqa wearing women look like letter boxes and bank robbers are examples of the type of dehumanising metaphors often used by radical right parties and actors, as argued by previous research (Fox et al, 2012; Hogan & Haltinner, 2015). All these examples can also be interpreted as being based on racist, xenophobic and, especially, islamophobic ideas.

Another example of a harsh formulation is when UKIP’s former party leader Henry Bolton said that “the weight of immigration and the rise of Islam is leading to British culture being ’buried’” (Tolhurst, 2017). This formulation can be interpreted as a metaphor for how Britain is being Islamized by the invasion of muslims. All these statements can also be interpreted as being based on racist, xenophobic and, in particular, islamophobic ideas.

It can be argued that the Conservative Party and UKIP share very similar opinions on how immigration creates big problems for British culture and values. Party representatives have also made use of a similar type of very radical right type of language when framing these issues. It can however be argued that Boris Johnson's use of dehumanising metaphors like letter boxes and bank robbers when describing burqa wearing women are examples of a more radical right language. Compared to the language that Bolton uses, Johnson’s language can possibly be interpreted as being based on even more racist, xenophobic and, especially, islamophobic ideas. In sum, it becomes evident that both parties make use of the ‘more threatening’ frame when framing immigration as a problem for culture and values.

**Problems for public services**

UKIP puts great focus on arguing that mass uncontrolled immigration has, among some other issues, put the NHS in crisis. The party further argues that immigrants take advantages of public services without contributing by paying taxes (United Kingdom Independence Party Interim Manifesto, 2018:4). This is similar to how the Conservative Party argues about how low skilled and low waged immigrants move to Britain because of financial incentives such as tax credits and child benefits (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto, 2015:30). Both parties want immigrants to live and work in Britain for five years before they can claim benefits from public services. The most radical right idea presented by both parties is the one
of that immigrants are argued to abuse public services such as the NHS. The Conservative Party takes the argument a bit further by saying that low skilled and low waged immigrants come to Britain to claim tax credits and child benefit. It can be argued that both parties make use of the ‘more threatening’ frame when framing immigrants as problems for public services. This is due to the fact that their proposals and arguments reflect radical right and very negative ideas about immigrants and on how to control immigration.

Problems for housing and urban growth

The Conservative Party wants to “introduce a new residency requirement for social housing, so that EU migrants cannot even be considered for a council house unless they have been living in an area for at least four years” (The Conservative and Unionist Party Manifesto, 2015:30). UKIP wants to introduce “a five-year residency qualification for any non-UK citizen buyer of residential property in designated areas in England” (United Kingdom Independence Party Interim Manifesto, 2018:11). It can possibly be argued that UKIP has more radical right ideas than the Conservative Party on this issue. This is due of the fact that UKIP argues much more about that mass uncontrolled immigration leads to an unsustainable population growth, which causes problems for the urban growth and puts a very high demand on housing that is cheaper to rent. However, it can be argued that both parties make use of the ’more threatening’ frame since they agree on establishing a very strict rule in order to control the type of immigration that is framed as harming Britain the most (low skilled and low waged immigrants). These very similar proposals can furthermore be interpreted as reflecting radical right ideas and more negative ideas about immigrants, especially about low skilled and low waged immigrants that are much less attractive for Britain than high skilled immigrants.

The parties seem to have a similar approach to how immigration is a problem for housing and urban growth, although UKIP’s arguments and proposals are more radical right than the ones presented by the Conservative Party. UKIP frames immigration as a problem for housing and urban growth by giving a more detailed picture of how mass uncontrolled immigration causes great problems, but the two parties end up with more or less the same solution on the housing problem. Both parties also use the same type of harsh formulations when framing immigration as a problem for housing and urban growth. The language is very formal even though it also can be described as quite harsh. There are however no examples of
how the parties make use of a very radical right language within this specific debate on how immigration is a problem for housing and urban growth.

Other findings

Another interesting difference between the party manifestos is how UKIP often refers to immigration by the formulation *mass uncontrolled immigration*, while the Conservative Party refers to immigration by the word *immigration*. The Conservative Party only refers to immigration being out of control by saying that ‘we have to control immigration’, while UKIP frequently argues that ‘mass uncontrolled immigration has to be controlled because of the fact that it is unsustainable for the British society’. This difference can possibly be interpreted as if UKIP tries to frame immigration as a huge problem that is really out of control, whilst the Conservative Party possibly sees immigration as a less treatful issue. This difference can thus be an example of how UKIP has, as expected, a bit more radical right ideas on immigration than what the Conservative Party has.

Discussion

In this section I will discuss the findings, strengths and drawbacks of the research. First, the findings of the research will be presented. Secondly, the limitations of the research will be discussed.

First of all, both parties frame immigration as the main factor causing many societal problems. Both parties have framed immigration as a problem for the labour market, for public order, national security and safety, for British culture and values, for public services, and for housing and urban growth. Both parties have framed immigration as very threatening and has thus proposed quite harsh solutions on how to control and restrict immigration. Moreover, low skilled and low waged immigrants are framed as the biggest issue for the British society and both parties are thus very keen on, in particular, controlling the immigration of these immigrants. It is important to mention that the Conservative Party has a large focus on other non-immigration-related issues as well, compared to UKIP that has a main focus on immigration. They are however very similar in their approaches on immigration when they discuss immigration and immigration-related issues.
Because of evidence from previous research (Alonso & da Fonseca, 2011; Bale, 2013; Partos & Bale, 2015), the parties were expected to be quite different even though they both are right wing parties. The Conservative Party was expected to lean more towards being mainstream/centre right, possibly in combination with radical right ideas on some issues. However, this research has shown that the Conservative Party is leaning more to the radical right than what previous research has argued. UKIP was expected to be radical right, which this research has confirmed. What was not expected was that the parties would have so many similarities. The parties have made great use of the so called ’more threatening’ frame when framing immigration. They have also proposed strict and often very similar solutions on how to control immigration and immigration-related issues. As shown in the comparative analysis, the Conservative Party and UKIP seem to agree on many issues, and their arguments and proposals often reflect the same radical right ideas on immigrants and on how to control them. As Benson & Wood (2015) argued, it was expected that both parties would make use of strict proposals on how to restrict and control immigration. It was however not expected that both parties would suggest very similar solutions.

Moreover, the examples of how party representatives have made use of radical right language show how party representatives from both parties base their statements on very similar radical right, racist, xenophobic and, in particular, islamophobic ideas. It can thus be argued that the parties and party representatives have very similar radical right, racist, xenophobic and islamophobic ideas about immigrants. Because of the research results and the many examples of how similar the partiers are, I would argue that they are, on the issue of immigration, standing very close to each other and far to the right on a centre right-radical right political spectrum. As expected, it can also be argued that UKIP stands a bit further to the right compared to the Conservative Party. Arguments and proposals by UKIP and its’ representatives can most often be argued to be more radical right than many of the arguments and proposals presented by the Conservative Party.

The parties were also expected to focus on different issues. The Conservative Party was, as argued by Helbling (2013), expected to focus on economic arguments about attracting the skills that Britain needs. This study suggests that the Conservative Party puts a lot of focus on attracting the best and brightest to the UK, but it also shows that the party has radical right ideas on the other four issues as well. UKIP, on the other hand, was expected to focus on arguments about security and labour (Ibid). This research suggests that UKIP
focuses quite equally on all five issues. The biggest focus is however put on problems for security and safety, and culture and values. As expected by other previous studies (Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018; Kaufmann, 2018; Huysmans & Buonfino, 2008), both parties and several party representatives seem to think that immigration is a great problem for British culture and values. Compared to the political discussions on the other issues, party representatives from both parties use a very radical right type of language when discussing problems for culture and values. As argued by previous research on national populism (Eatwell & Goodwin, 2018; Kaufmann, 2018), this can possibly be explained by the increased worries about immigration and its’ effects on culture, for example about immigration from culturally diverse countries such as muslim-majority countries.

An unexpected and especially interesting finding is the example of when the Conservative Party seems to have more radical right ideas than UKIP. This is when the Conservative Party argued that low skilled and low waged immigrants come to Britain to claim tax credits and child benefit. Both parties argued that immigrants abuse public services, but the Conservative Party took the argument further by mentioning that low skilled and low waged immigrants move to Britain to claim benefits that they have not deserved.

The findings of a descriptive study that is constructed as an analysis of ideas can be hard to generalize to other countries. It is however possible to expect that other mainstream/centre right parties have followed the same development as the Conservative Party. Sweden is an example of such a country where it can be expected that the mainstream/centre right Conservative Party (Moderaterna) moves towards radical right ideas on immigration as the party has opened up for discussion with the far right Sweden Democrats (Sverigedemokraterna). It is also possible to expect that other mainstream/centre right parties, especially in Western countries, have moved towards more radical right ideas on immigration.

A limitation worth mentioning is the choice of material. The material can possibly be a bit small because of the fact that a lot of material has been excluded. I have only included official party material and newspaper articles about immigration and the specific dimensions, which is in line with the purpose and the design of the research. The exclusion of other types of material such as blogs and social media feeds might result in this research underestimating the parties’ views on immigration. If I had included these types of material as well, the research could possibly have found that the parties are even more radical right in their views
on immigration. Another limitation is that the chosen material only includes the parties and their views on some immigration-related issues. There is probably a lot more material on the parties and their views on immigration and other immigration-related issues. This can also cause problems with this research underestimating the parties´ views on immigration. Future research should thus include other types of material as well, for example including social media feeds or articles on the parties and their more general views on immigration.

As discussed, a possible limitation with the analysis apparatus was the issue of maybe not knowing exactly what dimension and frame an argument or proposal refers to. This has however not been an issue and the operationalizations have helped solve this possible problem. Another, quite small, issue with the analysis apparatus was found during the analysis of the official party material. Although the five dimensions have captured most arguments and proposals, all arguments and proposals have not been captured. One argument in one of the UKIP manifests can be interpreted as if UKIP expresses fears of immigration from muslim-majority countries in general. This argument does not refer to a fear for a specific immigration-related issue and has thus not been included in the analysis. It is obvious that there is a lot more material, including arguments and quotes about more general fears for immigration, being excluded from this research since these arguments are not captured by the dimensions. The analysis apparatus has been a useful tool in the sense of that it has managed to capture most arguments and proposals, and has made it possible to do a more detailed comparative analysis on the Conservative Party and UKIP. There is however a possible problem with this research and the choice of analysis apparatus underestimating the parties´ radical right views on immigration.

Conclusion

The purpose with this paper has been to investigate how the Conservative Party frames immigration in contrast to how a radical right party like UKIP frames immigration. The purpose was furthermore to research whether the two parties take on a similar anti-immigrant approach when framing immigration, or if there are any differences in their ways of framing immigration. In order to fulfill this purpose, the research question was formulated as follows: How do the Conservative Party frame immigration in contrast to how UKIP frames immigration? This question has been answered by an analysis on arguments and proposals.
presented by the two political parties. Although the research has been built up like a comparative analysis, it is the findings about the Conservative Party that are interesting. It was already well known that UKIP is a radical right party with very negative ideas about immigration. It was however not as obvious where the Conservative Party could be placed on a centre right-radical right political spectrum and there were quite little knowledge about how the party has framed immigration during the past few years. Another limitation within previous research is the very limited amount of research on the framing of immigration in more detail. This is the reason for why this research has tried to dig deeper into the language and the ideas that lie behind the arguments and proposals on immigration.

Considering the aim of the thesis, an analysis of ideas has been a suitable method as it has allowed me to analyze political messages and the ideas that lie behind these messages. In order to answer the research question, the previous findings on the framing of immigration in political debates were used. Previous research was used to construct the analysis apparatus and as theoretical approach forming the expectations on the parties.

In conclusion, this research has investigated the similarities and differences between the Conservative Party and UKIP, and has managed to show that the parties are very similar in their approaches on immigration when they discuss immigration-related issues. Although it can be interpreted as if both parties have radical right ideas on immigration, it is important to mention that the parties have different focus on immigration. While UKIP has a main focus on immigration, the Conservative Party focuses on many non-immigration-related issues as well.

This paper has contributed with new knowledge to the field of research on the framing of immigration by political parties. Compared to previous research often arguing about the many differences between the two parties, the findings of this paper show how the parties are very similar in their views on immigration. As many political parties have become more radical right during the past few years (Solomos, 2013; Doerr, 2017), this paper also suggests that there is a possibility of other mainstream/centre right parties becoming more radical right. Future research could thus use a similar research design when investigating the same issue in other countries. As national populism is a fast growing movement in the western world, it could also be interesting to investigate whether left-wing parties have changed their views on immigration during the past few years, or if right wing parties are the only parties wanting to toughen up the control on immigration.
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